UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

KEVIN JOHNSON) 2:14-cv-00222-JCM-CWH
Plaintiff,	ORDER
vs.)
BRIAN E. WILLIAMS, SR., et al.,)
Defendants.)
)

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion to Compel (#17), filed June 26, 2015, and Defendants' Response (#19), filed July 9, 2015.

In the Scheduling Order (#16), the parties were specifically instructed that they "must first undertake a good faith effort to resolve any dispute among the parties." They were further pointed to Rule 37(a)(1), which requires any discovery motion to "include a certification that the movant has in good faith conferred or attempted to confer with the person or party failing to make disclosure or discovery in an effort to obtain it without court order." They were put on notice that Local Rule 26-7(b) provides that a discovery motion "will not be considered unless a statement of the movant is attached certifying that, after personal consultation and sincere effort to do so, the parties have been unable to resolve the matter without court action." They were informed that, given the nature of the lawsuit, the consultation requirements could be satisfied "either by a telephone consultation or a written communication whereby the inmate sincerely attempted to resolve the discovery dispute." Lastly, the parties were put on notice of LR 26-7(a), which requires all motions to compel discovery or for protective order to set forth in full the text of the discovery originally sought and the responses thereto, if any.

Plaintiff's motion to compel does not satisfy any of the foregoing requirements and, therefore, will be denied without prejudice. Plaintiff is instructed to comply with the requirements specifically set forth in the Scheduling Order before filing any additional discovery motions. Based on the foregoing and good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion to Compel (#17) is denied without prejudice. DATED: July 13, 2015. United States Magistrate Judge